



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

50

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/471,429	12/23/1999	DONALD E. WALLAR II	ST9-99-070	7384

7590 06/16/2005

DAVID N KOFFSKY ESQ
OHLANDT GREELEY RUGGIERO & PERLE LLP
ONE LAND MARK SQUARE
9TH FLOOR
STAMFORD, CT 069012682

EXAMINER

SHAH, SANJIV

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2176

DATE MAILED: 06/16/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/471,429	DONALD E. WALLAR II	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Sanjiv D. Shah	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 May 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-7 and 10-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-7, 10-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Request for Reconsideration filed on 5/13/05.
2. Claims 8 and 9 are cancelled. Claims 1-7 and 10-29 are pending in the case.

Drawings

3. The drawings filed on 12/23/99 are objected to as indicated in the attached PTO-948 form. Formal corrected drawings can be filed at allowance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless (a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treat) defined in section 351 (a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 1, 10, 15, and 20-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Guck (USPN 5,911,776 -filed on 12/1996, herein after "Guck").

Regarding independent claims 1,10, 15, 20, 21, and 23, Guck discloses:

Composing a computer message (on col. 2, lines 1-19 teaches an author could originate a text or message of his own personal format), comprising the steps of: (a) presenting a message composition area for entry of an unformatted message (on col. 2, lines 1-19, col. 6, lines 10-28, and col. 12, lines 56-65 teaches an author can create its own message or document in his own format such as Rich Text Format (RTF) (unformatted); the RTF is not a tagging language like TIFF, SGML or HTML) and a. message format selector for selecting an output format from a plurality of formats (on col. 6, lines 49-64 teaches the user sender can change the document by reformatting it in any one of the formats required for the intended recipients); a formatted message display area; converting unformatted message to form a formatted message with format tags of said one of output formats (on col. 5, lines 29-33, col. 6, lines 49-64, and on col. 9, lines 57-65 teaches converting Rich Text format (an untagged format) into TIFF (a tagged format); wherein the document will be reformatted in TIFF for display). Presenting message into one text field (col. 12, lines 57-60, wherein the file is a word file. It is inherent that a text field is present) having at least one associated selection field (col. 16, lines 13-23, wherein author creates text file and defines MIME type and selects format. It is inherent that file type is selected (MIME) along with format) and formatted message structured according to output format and selection field (Col 16, lines 15-23, as discussed above. It is inherent that output formatted message is structured in context with selection)

Regarding dependent claims 22 and 24, Guck discloses: displaying said formatted message for user review (on col. 7, lines 6-10: teaches text of a document or message can be displayed for review).

Regarding claims 25-29, they are substantially similar to claims 20-24 and are rejected under same rational.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 2-7, 11-14, and 16-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Guck, as applied to claims 1, 10, 15, and 20-29 above, in view of Ferrel et al. (USPN 6,230,173 B1 -filed on 07/19'95).

Regarding dependent claims 2, 11, and 16, Guck discloses the invention substantially as claimed as described supra. However, Guck does not explicitly disclose "message formats include SGML and book manager script".

Ferrel on col. 20, line 57 - col. 21, line 26 and col. 2.3, lines 30-33 teaches converting Rich Text (RTF) into a Multimedia Data Format file (MDF); wherein the MDF is the MPML markup language tagged storage; wherein MPML text derived from SGML and HTML.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Ferrel into Guck to provide a way to author documents from Rich Text format (RTF) to be converted into a MDF being a MPML markup language tagged storage, as taught by Ferrel, incorporated into the converting of RTF into TIFF, as taught by Guck, in order to provide the ability to place embedded objects within the structure of the document in an authoring environment.

Regarding dependent claims 3, 12, and 17, Guck discloses:

a formatted message display area (Duck on col . 5, lines 29-33, col. 6, lines 49-64, and on col. 9, lines 57-65 teaches converting Rich Text format (an untagged format) into TIFF (a tagged format); wherein the document will be formatted in TIFF for display).

Regarding dependent claims 4,13, and 18, Ferrel discloses:

wherein computer instructions for steps (a) and (b) are implemented in Java script (Ferrel on col. 14, line 65 -col. 15, line 3 teaches scripting controls to respond to actions or automatically perform actions at runtime).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Fen-el into Guck to provide a way to author documents from Rich Text format (RTF) to be converted into a MDF being a MPML markup language tagged storage, as taught by Ferrel, incorporated into the converting of RTF into TIFF, as taught by Guck, in order to provide the ability to place embedded objects within the structure of the document in an authoring environment.

Regarding dependent claims 5, 14, and 19, Guck discloses "wherein said unformatted message is a first unformatted message, said formatted message is a first formatted message, said message area further includes a formatted display area" on col. 5, lines 29-32 teaches converting rich text format (RTF) into the TIFF format (tag format).

Ferrel discloses "in response to entry of a second unformatted message into said second message composition area, converting said unformatted message to form a formatted message with format tags of said one of said output formats; and (d) presenting said first and second formatted messages as a concatenated complete message for display in said formatted message display area", on col. 2,

lines 36-47 teaches creating and displaying stories that are formatted from text document into SGML or HTML to be displayed in an on-line network; wherein producing documents that are tagged in either the SGML and HTML format (first and second message composition area); col. 3, lines 46-65 and on col. 20, line 57 --col. 21, line 26 teaches converting Rich Text format (RTF) to a MDF that holds is tagged language MPML (converting unformatted message into format tags).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Ferrel into Guck to provide a way to author documents from Rich Text format (RTF) to be converted into a MDF being a MPML markup language tagged storage, as taught by Ferret, incorporated into the converting of RTF into TIFF, as taught by Guck, in order to provide the ability to place embedded objects within the structure of the document in an authoring environment.

Regarding dependent claim 6, Guck discloses:

Guck discloses "editing first and second formatted messages and sending a copy of the formatted message to a computer message file" on cot. 6, lines 49-64 teaches author or user sender selects among various formats to reformat his document to send to various recipients and on cot. 12, lines 56-65 teaches creating a file and defining the file in a alternate format. Regarding dependent claim 7,

Ferrel discloses:

wherein said first and second composition areas and said formatted message display area are formed in a template that is presented an a web page, and wherein steps (e) and (f) are performed via said web page (Ferret on cot. 3, lines 46-65 teaches using Word template to help author produce documents with valid embedded codes).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Ferrel into Guck to provide a way to author documents from Rich Text format (RTF) to be converted into a MDF being a MPML markup language tagged storage, as taught by Ferrel,

incorporated into the converting of RTF into TIFF, as taught by Guck, in order to provide the ability to place embedded objects within the structure of the document in an authoring environment.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments filed 5/13/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that Guck fails to teach entering data by user in associated selection field. Applicant further argues that amended claims presents limitation of user entering format and how data is structured in its presentation of format. Examiner disagrees. Specifically the argued limitation is not claimed. The claimed invention presents a selection field along with text field and is silent about user entering structured data. Also Guck teaches definition phase as described in fig 3, wherein user enters format and file type (MIME), which is equivalent to claimed structured entry. Therefore applicant's arguments are not persuasive.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sanjiv D. Shah whose telephone number is (571) 272-4098. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph H. Feild can be reached on (571) 272-4090. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Sanjiv D. Shah
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2176

S. Shah
June 10, 2005